arXiv:1612.07105v1 [physics.atom-ph] 21 Dec 2016

Linearity theorem of multiphoton absorption

Christian Buth*
Theoretische Chemie, Physikalisch-Chemisches Institut, Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg, Im Neuenheimer Feld 229, 69120 Heidelberg, Germany
(Dated: 13 December 2016)

I classify multiphoton absorption into separable, linked, and simultaneous processes. The first and second types can be distinguished when the rate-equation approximation is valid whereas the third type refers to the case when the full quantum-electrodynamic description of multiphoton absorption is essential. For this purpose, I solve the rate equations without decay processes analytically which yields the linearity theorem of multiphoton absorption, i.e., even if many photons are absorbed the interaction with the light field is linear and I have the case of separable multiphoton absorption. Next I investigate a short-pulse approximation in which I first solve the rate equations without decay processes and then solve only rate equations for the ensuing decay. Finally, I examine the full rate equations and derive a successive approximation of the underlying Volterra integral equation leading to linked multiphoton absorption by the involved decay widths. The three methods are applied to a nitrogen atom in intense and ultrafast x rays from free-electron lasers (FELs). The linearity theorem barely approximates the results in the presence of decay processes. I find that the short-pulse approximation is suitable for lower charge states and for 200 as x-ray pulses. The successive approximation gives excellent agreement with the numerically-exact solution of the rate equations where, however, higher orders need to be taken into account.

I. INTRODUCTION

Rate equations which are systems of ordinary, first-order, linear differential equations [1] have recently come into focus in the study of the intense and ultrafast interaction of x rays with matter [e.g., Refs. 2–11] due to the development of x-ray lasers, especially the state-of-the-art x-ray FELs such as the the Linac Coherent Light Source (LCLS) [12, 13] in Menlo Park, California, USA. In these applications, the population of charge states of atoms and molecules due to ionization by the multiple absorption of x rays are investigated by numerically solving the rate equations [8, 11]. The solutions are then used to compute experimentally accessible quantities such as ion yields. Yet a more formal treatment of the underlying systems of differential equations has not been pursued to date.

Here I would like to investigate the solution of such rate equations analytically. I formulate and prove the linearity theorem of multiphoton absorption [14], a short-pulse approximation that uses this theorem with decay equations, and I investigate the successive approximation of the solution of the rate equations. This allows me to classify multiphoton absorption into simultaneous, linked, and separable processes. Namely, specialized to a two-photon process, there is the well-known simultaneous absorption of two photons [15] for x rays [2, 16] which is described in terms of quantum-electrodynamic expressions [17]. The attribute *simultaneous*, thereby, refers to the fact that two-photon absorption cannot be meaningfully broken up into isolated one-photon absorption events. This changes when the rate-equation approximation without simultaneous two-photon terms is applicable [2, 3, 8, 18, 19]. Then linked two-x-ray-photon absorption can be discussed as in [2] where it is exhibited in Sec. V A that decay widths establish the link between two distinct one-x-ray-photon absorptions. In this work, I also turn to the third case of separable multiphoton absorption hitherto not analyzed which is covered by the linearity theorem. The reader should always bear in mind that linked and separable multiphoton absorption are approximations to simultaneous absorption.

This article is structured as follows. Section II treats rate equations without decay processes which are introduced in Sec. II A. The linearity theorem of multiphoton absorption is proven in Sec. II B. Rate equations with decay processes are treated in Sec. III; they are formulated in Sec. III A. In Sec. III B, I examine rate equations with decay processes in a short-pulse approximation. Section III C contains the derivation of a Volterra integral equation from the rate equations with decay and its successive approximation. Results and discussions are in Sec. IV where the time evolution of the charge states of a nitrogen is predicted using the approximations derived before. Conclusions are drawn in Sec. V.

Equations are formulated in atomic units [20, 21]. All details of the calculations in this article are provided in the Supplementary Data [22].

II. RATE EQUATIONS WITHOUT DECAY PROCESSES

A. Closed system of rate equations

I set out from rate equations which describe x-ray nonlinear optical processes of atoms [2, 8] and molecules [8, 11]. The systems are assumed to be initially neutral

* World Wide Web: www.christianbuth.name, electronic mail; christian.buth@web.de

with $N \in \mathbb{N}$ electrons and in a nondegenerate ground state. The electronic configurations of the system are enumerated by a double index of the electron number $n \in \{0,\dots,N\}$ and the number of configurations $K^{(n)} \in \mathbb{N}$ in charge state n. The configurations are arranged with decreasing energy of configurations in each charge state. In total there are $K = \sum_{n=0}^{N} K^{(n)}$ configurations. There is only one neutral state and one electron-bare state, i.e., $K^{(0)} = K^{(N)} = 1$ [23]. For ease of notation, I let $K^{(N+1)} = 0$. With *x-ray flux* J I denote a real function in time with only a finite number of discontinuities which is greater than zero only on a finite time interval. With $\sigma^{(n)}_{j\leftarrow i}, \sigma^{(n)}_i \geq 0$ for $i \in \{1,\dots,K^{(n)}\}$, $j \in \{1,\dots,K^{(n-1)}\}$, and $n \in \{0,\dots,N\}$, I specify one-x-ray-photon absorption *cross sections*, partial and total cross sections, respectively [24]. Here $\sigma^{(n)}_{j\leftarrow i}$ is the cross section to transition from a configuration i with n electrons to a configuration j with $n-1$ electrons by one-x-ray-photon absorption. Typically not all configurations j can be reached from configuration i and $\sigma^{(n)}_{j\leftarrow i}$ is set to zero, if it is not possible. For notational convenience, I let $\sigma^{(0)}_{j\leftarrow 1} = \sigma^{(N+1)}_{1\leftarrow i} = 0$ for any i, j. The $\sigma^{(n)}_i$ is the cross section to transition from configuration i with n electrons to any accessible configuration with $n-1$ electrons. As no x rays can be absorbed by the electron-bare nucleus, I have for this configuration $\sigma^{(0)}_1 = 0$.

Rate equations can be constructed as follows. Given probabilities $P^{(n)}_j(t)$ at time $t \in \mathbb{R}$ which are differentiable, to find the system at time $t \in \mathbb{R}$ with n electrons in configuration j. The initial condition is specified at the *initial time* $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ as $P^{(n)}_j(\tau)$. Here I assume further that the system is initially in the single neutral charge state, i.e., $P^{(n)}_j(\tau) = \delta_{1\,j}\,\delta_{N\,n}$ with the Kronecker-δ [25]. Then the first rate equation, for the system in its neutral charge state reads

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}P^{(N)}_1(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\sigma^{(N)}_1\,P^{(N)}_1(t)\,J(t)\;; \tag{1}$$

it describes the ionization of the neutral system by the x rays. The rate equations of the singly-ionized system already have the full form of rate equations without decay processes

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}P^{(N-1)}_j(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = \left[\sigma^{(N)}_{j\leftarrow 1}\,P^{(N)}_1(t) - \sigma^{(N-1)}_j\,P^{(N-1)}_j(t)\right]J(t)\;; \tag{2}$$

for $j \in \{1,\dots,K^{(N-1)}\}$. This continues analogously until the last rate equation, for the electron-bare system, which is

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}P^{(0)}_1(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = \sum_{i=1}^{K^{(1)}} \sigma^{(1)}_{1\leftarrow i}\,P^{(1)}_i(t)\,J(t)\;. \tag{3}$$

The above said can be compactly summarized as follows. Inspecting the rate equations (1), (2), (3), I observe that there are K rate equations which form the $K\times K$ system of ordinary, first-order, linear, differential equations

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}P^{(n)}_j(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = \Big[\sum_{i=1}^{K^{(n+1)}} \sigma^{(n+1)}_{j\leftarrow i}\,P^{(n+1)}_i(t) - \sigma^{(n)}_j\,P^{(n)}_j(t)\Big]\,J(t)\;. \tag{4}$$

Then this constitutes a *system of rate equations*. If for such a system of rate equations the *total cross sections* are given by

$$\sigma^{(n)}_j = \sum_{i=1}^{K^{(n-1)}} \sigma^{(n)}_{i\leftarrow j}\;, \tag{5}$$

then it is termed a *closed system of rate equations*.

The system of rate equations (4) for all n, j can be rewritten compactly by letting $\boldsymbol{p}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^K$ stand for the vector with the entries $P^{(n)}_i(t)$, i.e.,

$$\boldsymbol{p}(t) = \big(P^{(N)}_1(t), P^{(N-1)}_1(t), \dots, P^{(N-1)}_{K^{(N-1)}}(t), \dots, P^{(0)}_1(t)\big)^{\mathrm{T}}\;. \tag{6}$$

The partial cross sections $\sigma^{(n)}_{j\leftarrow i}$ form a strictly lower triangular matrix and $-\sigma^{(n)}_i$ are on the matrix diagonal. Together they are referred to as the *cross section matrix* $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$. With this notation, I express (4) as

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{p}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\,\boldsymbol{p}(t)\,J(t)\;. \tag{7}$$

The structure of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ can be characterized by

Definition 1. A real $K\times K$ matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ that has the *closure property*:

$$-A_{ii} = \sum_{j=1}^{K} A_{ji}\;, \tag{8}$$

for all $i \in \{1,\dots,K\}$ is referred to as *closed matrix*.

The closure property (5) implies that $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ in (7) is a closed matrix.

Lemma 1. *The probability of a closed system of rate equations (4) is conserved.*

Proof. As $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is a closed matrix (5), I observe that the column sums of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ vanish, i.e., $\sum_{i=1}^{K}\Sigma_{ij} = 0$ for all $j \in \{1,\dots,K\}$. Then it follows by summing the components of (7):

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\sum_{i=1}^{K} p_i(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{K}\Big[\sum_{i=1}^{K}\Sigma_{ij}\Big]\,p_j(t)\,J(t) = 0\;, \tag{9}$$

that the probability is conserved for all times t. q.e.d.

B. Linearity theorem of multiphoton absorption

As $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is lower triangular, its eigenvalues are the diagonal elements $-\sigma_i^{(n)}$ which are negative or zero such as the last one $-\sigma_1^{(0)} = 0$—because the electron-bare nucleus cannot be ionized further—and pairwise distinct as the total absorption cross sections $\sigma_i^{(n)}$ refer to different configurations i of charge state n where, on configuration level, there are no degeneracies. Following Lemma 2, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is diagonalizable where the eigenvalues form the diagonal matrix $\boldsymbol{\Lambda} = \mathbf{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_K)$ and the eigenvectors are gathered in the matrix $\boldsymbol{U}$. As $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is time independent, so are $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ and $\boldsymbol{U}$. Transforming (7) to the eigenbasis of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{U}^{-1}\,\frac{\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{p}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = \frac{\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{q}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= \boldsymbol{U}^{-1}\,\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\,\boldsymbol{U}\,\boldsymbol{U}^{-1}\,\boldsymbol{p}(t)\,J(t) \\ &= \boldsymbol{\Lambda}\,\boldsymbol{q}(t)\,J(t)\;, \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

which is a decoupled system of ordinary first-order linear differential equations. The ℓ th equation reads

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}q_\ell(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = \lambda_\ell\,q_\ell(t)\,J(t)\;, \tag{11}$$

which has the solution

$$q_\ell(t) = q_\ell(\tau)\;\mathrm{e}^{\lambda_\ell\,\Phi(t)}\;, \tag{12}$$

for an integration starting at $t = \tau$ with the initial value of $q_\ell(\tau) \equiv (\boldsymbol{U}^{-1}\,\boldsymbol{p}(\tau))_\ell$ and the *x-ray fluence*

$$\Phi(t) = \int_\tau^t J(t')\,\mathrm{d}t'\;. \tag{13}$$

As the system is initially in its ground state, I have $\boldsymbol{p}(\tau) = (1, 0, \ldots, 0)^{\mathrm{T}} \in \mathbb{R}^K$ and thus $q_\ell(\tau) = (\boldsymbol{U}^{-1})_{\ell 1}$. From the solution $\boldsymbol{q}(t)$, the probabilities follow via $\boldsymbol{p}(t) = \boldsymbol{U}\,\boldsymbol{q}(t)$, hence

$$p_i(t) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{K} U_{i\ell}\,q_\ell(t) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{K} U_{i\ell}\,q_\ell(\tau)\;\mathrm{e}^{-|\lambda_\ell|\,\Phi(t)}\;, \tag{14}$$

which is the unique solution of the system of rate equations (7).

I observe that $p_i(t)$ depends *only* on the x-ray fluence $\Phi(t)$ as it is the case for one-photon absorption [8]. The sign of λ_ℓ in (12) was made explicit in (14); it implies that the exponential functions in (14) decay quickly to zero with increasing fluence meaning that the probability of the system at time t to be in the configuration i *with* electrons decays to zero such that for $\Phi(t) \to \infty$, eventually, only the last configuration K of the system which is stripped bare of electrons, i.e., $\lambda_K = 0$, has unit probability [see (9)]. Conversely, the limit $\Phi(t) \to 0$ lets all exponential functions in (14) become unity and thus $\boldsymbol{p}(t) = \boldsymbol{p}(\tau)$, i.e., the system remains in the initial state for all times t.

The solution (14) of the rate equations (7) is recast, by expanding the exponential function into a series using $\boldsymbol{q}(\tau) = \boldsymbol{U}^{-1}\,\boldsymbol{p}(\tau)$, yielding

$$\begin{aligned} p_i(t) &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{\Phi^m(t)}{m!} \sum_{\ell,j=1}^{K} (\boldsymbol{U})_{i\ell}\,\lambda_\ell^m\,(\boldsymbol{U}^{-1})_{\ell j}\,p_j(\tau) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{K} p_j(\tau) \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{\Phi^m(t)}{m!}\,\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{ij}^m \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{K} \big(\mathrm{e}^{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\,\Phi(t)}\big)_{ij}\;p_j(\tau)\;. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

The middle expression in (15) exhibits the perturbative nature of the problem. Namely, the probability $\boldsymbol{p}(t)$ is composed of the summands with increasing powers of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\,\Phi(t)$, i.e., zero-photon absorption gives $\mathbb{1}$, one-photon absorption adds $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\,\Phi(t)$, two-photon absorption adds $\frac{1}{2}\,\big(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\,\Phi(t)\big)^2$, ... The above said proves

Theorem 1 (Linearity theorem of multiphoton absorption)**.** *Given a closed system of rate equations (4), then there is no nonlinearity in the interaction of x rays with the system and all multiphoton processes can be decomposed in terms of subsequent (chained) one-x-ray-photon absorptions (15).*

The situation that is described by Theorem 1 is termed *separable multiphoton absorption*. The dependence of $\boldsymbol{p}(t)$ on t is nonlinear due to the exponential functions in (14) that become constants which depend only on the x-ray fluence after the x-ray pulse has passed for $t \to \infty$. In the case of separable multiphoton processes, no nonlinearity in the interaction is present. The fact that the exponential series always converges ought not to mislead the reader: this convergence does not imply that the physical problem of multiphoton absorption actually is amenable to a perturbative treatment which leads to the cross sections that enter (4). This fact needs to be established independently.

III. RATE EQUATIONS WITH DECAY PROCESSES

A. Closed system of rate equations

In many cases the formulation of the rate equations (4) from Sec. II A represent an idealization because there are decay processes occurring. First, there is electronic decay in which an electron drops from a higher shell to a lower shell releasing the excess energy by ejecting another electron from a higher shell. Second, there is radiative decay where an electron drops from a higher shell to a lower shell emitting a photon with an energy corresponding to the energy difference between the two shells involved in the transition. For electronic decay, the final state has one electron less compared with the initial state

whereas in radiative decay the number of electrons is left unchanged.

With decay widths, the rate equations (4) become

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathrm{d}P_j^{(n)}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = &\Big[\sum_{i=1}^{K^{(n+1)}} \sigma_{j\leftarrow i}^{(n+1)}\, P_i^{(n+1)}(t) - \sigma_j^{(n)}\, P_j^{(n)}(t)\Big]\, J(t) \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^{K^{(n+1)}} \gamma_{\mathrm{E},j\leftarrow i}^{(n+1)}\, P_i^{(n+1)}(t) \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^{K^{(n)}} \gamma_{\mathrm{R},j\leftarrow i}^{(n)}\, P_i^{(n)}(t) \\ &- \gamma_j^{(n)}\, P_j^{(n)}(t)\ ,\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where the partial decay widths for electronic decay are $\gamma_{\mathrm{E},j\leftarrow i}^{(n+1)} \geq 0$ and for radiative decay are $\gamma_{\mathrm{R},j\leftarrow i}^{(n)} \geq 0$. Note that $\gamma_{\mathrm{R},j\leftarrow i}^{(n)} = 0$ for $j \geq i$. The total decay width of a system in configuration j with n electrons to make a transition to any in this way accessible other configuration is $\gamma_j^{(n)} = \gamma_{\mathrm{E},j}^{(n)} + \gamma_{\mathrm{R},j}^{(n)}$ in analogy to (5) given by

$$\gamma_{\mathrm{E},j}^{(n)} = \sum_{i=1}^{K^{(n-1)}} \gamma_{\mathrm{E},i\leftarrow j}^{(n)} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_{\mathrm{R},j}^{(n)} = \sum_{i=1}^{K^{(n)}} \gamma_{\mathrm{R},i\leftarrow j}^{(n)}\ . \tag{17}$$

The decay widths $\gamma_{\mathrm{R},j\leftarrow i}^{(n)}$ and $\gamma_j^{(n)}$ make their first appearance in the rate equations for $n = N-1$, i.e., Eq. (2), and the $\gamma_{\mathrm{E},j\leftarrow i}^{(n)}$ start to appear in the rate equations for $n = N-2$. There is no decay in the first rate equation, for the system in its neutral charge state which has the same form as (1). The last rate equation, for the electron-bare system, similar to (3), also does not contain a decay width.

Introducing the notation of (6) and (7), I express (16) compactly as

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{p}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\ \mathfrak{p}(t)\, J(t) + \boldsymbol{\Gamma}\ \mathfrak{p}(t)\ . \tag{18}$$

I have, additionally, the matrix of decay widths $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$. Because of the radiative decay widths, for this matrix to be lower trigonal with the negative of the total decay widths on the diagonal, the electron configurations need to be sorted with decreasing energy. Further the first and last rows and column of $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ are filled with zeros; the inner part shall be referred to by $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}'$, i.e., $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ can be written as the direct sum $\boldsymbol{\Gamma} = (0) \oplus \boldsymbol{\Gamma}' \oplus (0)$. Due to the closure property (17), $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ is a closed matrix and the probability in the system of rate equations (16) is conserved in analogy to Lemma 1.

B. Decay equation

Inspecting (18), I find that, with decay widths present, one cannot proceed any longer as for the case without decay widths because the matrix on the right-hand side of (18) cannot be diagonalized by a time-independent matrix as in (10). Certainly, Equation (18) can be integrated numerically as in [8] but here I would like to determine an approximate solution of it. I obtain the solution (14) of the rate equations neglecting the decay widths (7) first. Thereby, I assume that the x-ray pulse is so short that, in the course of the interaction, no noticeable decay of excited states occurs. Second, I solve (18) without cross sections, i.e., the *decay equation*:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{p}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}\ \mathfrak{p}(t)\ , \tag{19}$$

by going to the eigenbasis of $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ [1]. Namely, the decay widths for different electronic configurations of the system are pairwise distinct or zero; then, according to Lemma 2, the matrix $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ is diagonalizable. Thus I have $\boldsymbol{\Gamma} = \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{U}}\, \boldsymbol{M}\, \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{U}}^{-1}$ with the matrix of eigenvectors $\boldsymbol{\mathfrak{U}}$ and the matrix of eigenvalues $\boldsymbol{M} = \mathbf{diag}(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_K)$. I arrive at the decoupled system of differential equations of the decay

$$\boldsymbol{\mathfrak{U}}^{-1}\ \frac{\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{p}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = \frac{\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{q}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = \boldsymbol{M}\ \mathfrak{q}(t)\ , \tag{20}$$

which has the solution with $1 \leq \ell \leq K$, in analogy to (12), given by

$$\mathfrak{q}_\ell(t) = \mathfrak{q}_\ell(\mathfrak{T})\ \mathrm{e}^{\mu_\ell\,(t-\mathfrak{T})}\ . \tag{21}$$

The starting probabilities are found from the solution of the system of rate equations without decay (14) and (15). They are $\mathfrak{p}(\mathfrak{T}) = \boldsymbol{p}(T) = \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{U}}\, \mathfrak{q}(\mathfrak{T}) \iff \mathfrak{q}(\mathfrak{T}) = \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{U}}^{-1}\, \mathfrak{p}(\mathfrak{T}) = \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{U}}^{-1}\, \boldsymbol{U}\, \boldsymbol{q}(T)$ where $\boldsymbol{q}(T)$ is given by (12). *Nota bene*, that not necessarily $\mathfrak{T} = T$ holds. I introduced this flexibility, to allow the decay equations to be integrated also from a $\mathfrak{T}$ as the onset time of decay processes.

The solution of the decay equations (21) is transformed back from the eigenbasis of $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ to the original basis via

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{p}_i(t) &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{K} \mathfrak{U}_{i\ell}\ \mathrm{e}^{\mu_\ell\,(t-\mathfrak{T})}\ \mathfrak{q}_\ell(\mathfrak{T}) \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\ell,j=1}^{K} \mathfrak{U}_{i\ell}\, \mu_\ell^n\, (\boldsymbol{\mathfrak{U}}^{-1})_{\ell j}\, \frac{(t-T)^n}{n!}\, \mathfrak{p}_j(\mathfrak{T})\ .\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

I arrive at the compact form of the solution into which the solution of the rate equations without decay (15) is inserted proving

Theorem 2. *The solution of rate equations with decay processes (18) in terms of a solution of the rate equations without decay (7) and subsequently the decay equation (19) reads*

$$\mathfrak{p}(t) = \mathrm{e}^{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\,(t-\mathfrak{T})}\ \mathfrak{p}(\mathfrak{T}) = \mathrm{e}^{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\,(t-\mathfrak{T})}\ \mathrm{e}^{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\,\Phi(T)}\ \boldsymbol{p}(0)\ . \tag{23}$$

Photoionization lasts till time T and decay processes start at time $\mathfrak{T}$.

C. Successive approximation

To find a solution of the interacting and decaying system, I set out from the coupled system of differential equations (18). Changing to the eigenbasis of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ as for (10) produces

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{q}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = \boldsymbol{\Lambda}\ \mathfrak{q}(t)\, J(t) + \boldsymbol{\Delta}\ \mathfrak{q}(t)\ , \tag{24}$$

with $\boldsymbol{\Delta} = \boldsymbol{U}^{-1}\,\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\,\boldsymbol{U}$. This coupled system can only be solved numerically. To find an approximative analytic solution, I express (24) componentwise by

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{q}_i(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = \lambda_i\ \mathfrak{q}_i(t)\, J(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{K} \Delta_{ij}\ \mathfrak{q}_j(t)\ , \tag{25}$$

for $i \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$. Letting $\mathfrak{q}_i(t) = \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_i\,\Phi(t)}\,\mathfrak{r}_i(t)$, I have

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{r}_i(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = \sum_{j=1}^{K} \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_i\,\Phi(t)}\,\Delta_{ij}\,\mathrm{e}^{\lambda_j\,\Phi(t)}\ \mathfrak{r}_j(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{K} \Xi_{ij}\ \mathfrak{r}_j(t)\ , \tag{26}$$

or in vector notation

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{r}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = \boldsymbol{\Xi}(t)\ \mathfrak{r}(t)\ . \tag{27}$$

The time-dependent matrix $\boldsymbol{\Xi}(t)$ can be expressed succinctly by

$$\boldsymbol{\Xi}(t) = \mathrm{e}^{-\boldsymbol{\Lambda}\,\Phi(t)}\ \boldsymbol{\Delta}\ \mathrm{e}^{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}\,\Phi(t)} = \boldsymbol{U}^{-1}\ \mathrm{e}^{-\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\,\Phi(t)}\ \boldsymbol{\Gamma}\ \mathrm{e}^{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\,\Phi(t)}\ \boldsymbol{U}\ . \tag{28}$$

Equation (27) can be integrated on both sides leading to

$$\mathfrak{r}(t) = \mathfrak{r}(\tau) + \int_{\tau}^{t} \boldsymbol{\Xi}(t')\ \mathfrak{r}(t')\ \mathrm{d}t'\ . \tag{29}$$

This is a linear Volterra integral equation of the second kind [26–28]. Its kernel $\boldsymbol{\Xi}(t')$ is continuous because the x-ray fluence (13) is a continuous function with time. Then the solution of Eq. (29) is continuous as well. Volterra equations can be solved uniquely by successive approximation [26, 27, 29]—i.e., inserting (29) for $\mathfrak{r}(t')$ in (29)—reading

$$\mathfrak{r}(t) = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}(t,\tau)\ \mathfrak{r}(\tau)\ , \tag{30}$$

introducing the time-evolution matrix via

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}(t,\tau) = \mathbb{1} &+ \int_{\tau}^{t} \boldsymbol{\Xi}(t')\ \mathrm{d}t' \\ &+ \int_{\tau}^{t} \boldsymbol{\Xi}(t') \int_{\tau}^{t'} \boldsymbol{\Xi}(t'')\ \mathrm{d}t''\,\mathrm{d}t' + \ldots\ ,\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

which transforms the initial condition $\mathfrak{r}(\tau)$ into the solution $\mathfrak{r}(t)$ at time t. This is the matrix that needs to be evaluated in order to solve (30).

To transform back from the eigenbasis of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ to the original basis, I realize that

$$\mathfrak{q}(t) = \mathrm{e}^{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}\,\Phi(t)}\ \mathfrak{r}(t) = \boldsymbol{U}^{-1}\,\mathfrak{p}(t)\ , \tag{32}$$

holds with the initial condition $\mathfrak{q}(\tau) = \mathfrak{r}(\tau) = \boldsymbol{U}^{-1}\,\mathfrak{p}(\tau)$. This proves that the solution of the Volterra integral equation can be written concisely as stated in

Theorem 3. *Given a system of rate equations with decay (18), then its solution is*

$$\mathfrak{p}(t) = \mathrm{e}^{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\,\Phi(t)}\ \boldsymbol{U}\,\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}(t,\tau)\,\boldsymbol{U}^{-1}\,\mathfrak{p}(\tau)\ , \tag{33}$$

with the time-evolution matrix (31) which can be expressed via (28) as

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{U}\,\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}(t,\tau)\,\boldsymbol{U}^{-1} = \mathbb{1} &+ \int_{\tau}^{t} \mathrm{e}^{-\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\,\Phi(t')}\ \boldsymbol{\Gamma}\ \mathrm{e}^{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\,\Phi(t')}\ \mathrm{d}t' \\ &+ \int_{\tau}^{t} \mathrm{e}^{-\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\,\Phi(t')}\ \boldsymbol{\Gamma}\ \mathrm{e}^{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\,\Phi(t')} \int_{\tau}^{t'} \mathrm{e}^{-\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\,\Phi(t'')}\ \boldsymbol{\Gamma}\ \mathrm{e}^{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\,\Phi(t'')}\ \mathrm{d}t''\,\mathrm{d}t' \\ &+ \ldots\ .\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

The final result (34) clearly exhibits the role of decay processes for turning the interaction with x rays nonlinear in contrast to the case without decay in Theorem 1. This case is referred to as *linked multiphoton absorption*.

The derivation of this subsection resembles in many aspects the derivation of the time-dependent perturbation series in quantum field theory on pages 56–58 of Ref. 30. Thereby, Eq. (24) is structurally similar to the time-dependent Schrödinger equation for an interacting quantum system, however, with the crucial difference that in our case the time derivative is not multiplied by the imaginary unit. Then $\boldsymbol{\Xi}(t)$ [(28)] stands for the time-dependent perturbation in the interaction picture and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}(t,\tau)$ corresponds to the time-evolution operator. Note that, in contrast to time-dependent perturbation theory, the exactly solvable part [first term on the right-hand side of Eq. (24)] is time dependent via $J(t)$. In time-dependent perturbation theory, one proceeds by introducing time-ordered products and expressing the series (34) in terms of an exponential function [30].

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

I illustrate the theory of the previous Secs. II and III by applying it to the rate equations of a nitrogen atom, which has $N = 7$ electrons, in LCLS radiation [8]. I assume an x-ray photon energy of 840 eV and a fluence of $8 \times 10^{11}\ \frac{\text{photons}}{\mu\text{m}^2}$. The temporal pulse shape of the x-ray flux is Gaussian (See Eq. (7) in Ref. 8) and the spatial dependence is assumed to be constant. I calculate the probability to find the atomic cationic state with charge $j \in \{0, \ldots, N\}$ via

$$W_j(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{K^{(N-j)}} P_i^{(N-j)}(t)\ . \tag{35}$$



FIG. 1. (Color) Ground-state depletion $W_0(t)$ at time t of a nitrogen atom with the numerically-exact solution (solid-black lines) and the linearity theorem (15) (dashed-red lines).



FIG. 2. (Color) Single ionization $W_1(t)$ at time t of a nitrogen atom. Line styles as in Fig. 1.

This quantity allows one to calculate the experimentally mensurable ion yields from which follows the average charge state that is an indicator of the amount of charge found on the ions [8, 11].

In Fig. 1, I plot the numerically-exact solution of the rate equations for a nitrogen atom together with the result from the linearity theorem (15). Both curves are indistinguishable which is not surprising as the rate-equation for ground-state depletion (1) does not contain any decay terms.

Single ionization is investigated in Fig. 2 and, again, a good agreement with the reference curve is found. However, this time, there is a decay term in the rate equations (16) which leads to a easily discernible deviation between both curves at the peak. The fact that the long-term behavior of both curves agrees so well can only be ascribed to the fact that further ionization of the atom leads to the observed decay and not Auger or radiative decay as they are not described by the linearity theorem (15).

The decay equations (19) are used in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4



FIG. 3. (Color) Double ionization $W_2(t)$ at time t of a nitrogen atom with the numerically-exact solution (solid-black lines), the linearity theorem (15) (dashed-red lines), and the decay equation (19) (dotdashed-green lines) for an x-ray pulse with a FWHM duration of 2 fs.



FIG. 4. (Color) Double ionization $W_2(t)$ as in Fig. 3 but for an x-ray pulse with a FWHM duration of 200 as.

for x-ray pulses with a FWHM duration of 2 fs and 200 as, respectively, to examine double ionization. Thereby, I choose the time when the decay processes start $\mathfrak{T}$ to be the FWHM duration but the time T at which the linearity theorem (15) is evaluated is chosen larger than $\mathfrak{T}$. Clearly, the curve from the decay equations in Fig. 3 shows a significant improvement over the result from the linearity theorem but does not approximate the numerically-exact solution acceptably. This changes dramatically if the FWHM pulse duration is decreased by an order of magnitude to 200 as in Fig. 4 where excellent agreement is achieved. After the pulse is over the double ionization probability rises on the time scale of Auger decay of core holes of 6.7 fs [8] which turns singly ionized nitrogen atoms into doubly ionized ones. Noteworthy is that this excellent agreement seen for double ionization does not remain so for charge states N^{4+} and higher. For them to be accurately described by the decay equation, one needs to shorten the pulse duration even further.



FIG. 5. (Color) Triple ionization $W_3(t)$ at time t of a nitrogen atom with the numerically-exact solution (solid-black lines), the linearity theorem (15) (dashed-red lines), and the successive approximation (33) in first (dash-dotted-green) and eighth order (dotted-blue).

Triple ionization of a nitrogen atom is displayed in Fig. 5 for the results from the linearity theorem, the successive approximation, and the numerically-exact solution. The linearity theorem produces a curve which only very crudely follows the behavior of the numerically-exact solution. Clearly, the absence of decay processes in the approximation leads to the overpopulation of the triple-ionization channels for $t > 0$. Furthermore, after the pulse is over, the probability remains constant whereas the numerically-exact solution slopes downward due to decay processes. Taking decay into account in terms of the successive approximation (33) in first order leads to a good agreement up to $\approx 0.5\,\mathrm{fs}$. Afterwards the approximation quickly deteriorates. However, going to eighth order in the approximation of the Volterra integral equation improves the result dramatically such that it agrees with the numerically-exact solution up to $\approx 4.5\,\mathrm{fs}$. Still higher orders in the successive approximation are required to approximate the numerically-exact result beyond this time.

The successive approximation exhibits a fairly slow convergence with the number of iterations of the Volterra integral equation. This can be understood by considering very short pulses for which the solution of the decay equation (19) is acceptable. Then the iteration of the Volterra integral equation needs to reproduce the terms of the series of the exponential function with the decay matrix in (19) up to sufficiently high order to obtain good agreement. The larger the time, the higher orders in the series need to be included.

V. CONCLUSION

I carry out a formal analysis of multiphoton absorption which is called simultaneous, if it is described by the proper quantum-electrodynamic expressions. If a rate equation approximation turns out to be satisfactory, I can also distinguish linked multiphoton absorption—which are rendered nonlinear by the decay of intermediate states—and separable multiphoton absorption which depends only on the fluence the atom or molecule was subjected to—just like one-photon absorption. I turn to decay processes and analyze the situation that the x-ray pulse is so short that one needs not consider decay in the course of it. Then the ensuing decay can be treated independently and an analytic expression is obtained for the probabilities to find the atom in specific states after the pulse is over. Finally, I solve the coupled rate equations that describe the joint process of x-ray absorption and decay. This is achieved by recasting the problem in terms of a Volterra integral equation which is amenable to a solution by successive approximation. I apply the equations to a nitrogen atom in LCLS x rays which reveals that decay processes are crucial for an accurate description, the decay equation is acceptable for very short pulses, and the successive approximation needs to be carried out to fairly high orders.

The research opens up rich perspectives for future work. The formulation of multiphoton absorption that has been devised here can be used in formal developments and practical applications. The successive approximation can easily be extended, e.g., to include also two-photon absorption, by augmenting the decay part by appropriate terms.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks to Simona Scheit and Jochen Schirmer for helpful discussions and a critical reading of the manuscript.

Appendix A: Diagonalizability of a closed, lower triangular matrix

Lemma 2. *Given a real, lower triangular $K \times K$ matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ whose nonzero eigenvalues—the nonzero diagonal elements—, if any, are pairwise distinct; the eigenvalue 0 may occur multiple times. Furthermore, $\boldsymbol{A}$ is a closed matrix (8). Then $\boldsymbol{A}$ is diagonalizable and the eigenvectors corresponding to eigenvalues 0, if any, are given by Cartesian eigenvectors $\boldsymbol{e}_i$ where $i \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$ and the value 1 in these vectors is at the row index i of the eigenvalue 0 of $\boldsymbol{A}$.*

Proof. As $\boldsymbol{A}$ is closed (8), for $A_{ii} = 0$ follows that $A_{ji} = 0$ for all j, i.e., the entire column of $\boldsymbol{A}$ is filled with zeros. Consequently, I have

$$\boldsymbol{A}\,\boldsymbol{e}_i = A_{ii}\,\boldsymbol{e}_i = \boldsymbol{0}\,. \tag{A1}$$

Thus for all eigenvalues 0 of $\boldsymbol{A}$ I have found eigenvectors, i.e., the algebraic multiplicity in the characteristic

polynom due to eigenvalue 0 corresponds to its geometric multiplicity. All other eigenvalues are pairwise distinct. Hence the characteristic polynom contains only linear factors with respect to these eigenvalues. Thus $\boldsymbol{A}$ is diagonalizable. q.e.d.

[1] Wolfgang Walter, *Gewöhnliche Differentialgleichungen*, 7th ed. (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2000).

[2] Nina Rohringer and Robin Santra, "X-ray nonlinear optical processes using a self-amplified spontaneous emission free-electron laser," Phys. Rev. A **76**, 033416 (2007).

[3] M. G. Makris, P. Lambropoulos, and A. Mihelič, "Theory of multiphoton multielectron ionization of xenon under strong 93-eV radiation," Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 033002 (2009).

[4] Matthias Hoener, Li Fang, Oleg Kornilov, Oliver Gessner, Stephen T. Pratt, Markus Gühr, Elliot P. Kanter, Cosmin Blaga, Christoph Bostedt, John D. Bozek, Philip H. Bucksbaum, Christian Buth, Mau Chen, Ryan Coffee, James Cryan, Louis DiMauro, Michael Glownia, Erik Hosler, Edwin Kukk, Stephen R. Leone, Brian McFarland, Marc Messerschmidt, Brendan Murphy, Vladimir Petrovic, Daniel Rolles, and Nora Berrah, "Ultraintense x-ray induced ionization, dissociation, and frustrated absorption in molecular nitrogen," Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 253002 (2010).

[5] L. Young, E. P. Kanter, B. Krässig, Y. Li, A. M. March, S. T. Pratt, R. Santra, S. H. Southworth, N. Rohringer, L. F. DiMauro, G. Doumy, C. A. Roedig, N. Berrah, L. Fang, M. Hoener, P. H. Bucksbaum, J. P. Cryan, S. Ghimire, J. M. Glownia, D. A. Reis, J. D. Bozek, C. Bostedt, and M. Messerschmidt, "Femtosecond electronic response of atoms to ultra-intense x-rays," Nature **466**, 56–61 (2010).

[6] Sang-Kil Son, Linda Young, and Robin Santra, "Impact of hollow-atom formation on coherent x-ray scattering at high intensity," Phys. Rev. A **83**, 033402 (2011).

[7] Sang-Kil Son, Linda Young, and Robin Santra, "Erratum: Impact of hollow-atom formation on coherent x-ray scattering at high intensity [Phys. Rev. A 83, 033402 (2011)]," Phys. Rev. A **83**, 069906(E) (2011).

[8] Christian Buth, Ji-Cai Liu, Mau Hsiung Chen, James P. Cryan, Li Fang, James M. Glownia, Matthias Hoener, Ryan N. Coffee, and Nora Berrah, "Ultrafast absorption of intense x rays by nitrogen molecules," J. Chem. Phys. **136**, 214310 (2012), arXiv:1201.1896.

[9] Nina Rohringer, Duncan Ryan, Richard A. London, Michael Purvis, Felicie Albert, James Dunn, John D. Bozek, Christoph Bostedt, Alexander Graf, Randal Hill, Stefan P. Hau-Riege, and Jorge J. Rocca, "Atomic inner-shell x-ray laser at 1.46 nm pumped by an x-ray free electron laser," Nature **481**, 488–491 (2012).

[10] Bernhard W. Adams, Christian Buth, Stefano M. Cavaletto, Jörg Evers, Zoltán Harman, Christoph H. Keitel, Adriana Pálffy, Antonio Picón, Ralf Röhlsberger, Yuri Rostovtsev, and Kenji Tamasaku, "X-ray quantum optics," J. Mod. Opt. **60**, 2–21 (2013).

[11] Ji-Cai Liu, Nora Berrah, Lorenz S. Cederbaum, James P. Cryan, James M. Glownia, Kenneth J. Schafer, and Christian Buth, "Rate equations for nitrogen molecules in ultrashort and intense x-ray pulses," J. Phys. B **49**, 075602 (2016), arXiv:1508.05223.

[12] J. Arthur, P. Anfinrud, P. Audebert, K. Bane, I. Ben-Zvi, V. Bharadwaj, R. Bionta, P. Bolton, M. Borland, P. H. Bucksbaum, R. C. Cauble, J. Clendenin, M. Cornacchia, G. Decker, P. Den Hartog, S. Dierker, D. Dowell, D. Dungan, P. Emma, I. Evans, G. Faigel, R. Falcone, W. M. Fawley, M. Ferrario, A. S. Fisher, R. R. Freeman, J. Frisch, J. Galayda, J.-C. Gauthier, S. Gierman, E. Gluskin, W. Graves, J. Hajdu, J. Hastings, K. Hodgson, Z. Huang, R. Humphry, P. Ilinski, D. Imre, C. Jacobsen, C.-C. Kao, K. R. Kase, K.-J. Kim, R. Kirby, J. Kirz, L. Klaisner, P. Krejcik, K. Kulander, O. L. Landen, R. W. Lee, C. Lewis, C. Limborg, E. I. Lindau, A. Lumpkin, G. Materlik, S. Mao, J. Miao, S. Mochrie, E. Moog, S. Milton, G. Mulhollan, K. Nelson, W. R. Nelson, R. Neutze, A. Ng, D. Nguyen, H.-D. Nuhn, D. T. Palmer, J. M. Paterson, C. Pellegrini, S. Reiche, M. Renner, D. Riley, C. V. Robinson, S. H. Rokni, S. J. Rose, J. Rosenzweig, R. Ruland, G. Ruocco, D. Saenz, S. Sasaki, D. Sayre, J. Schmerge, D. Schneider, C. Schroeder, L. Serafini, F. Sette, S. Sinha, D. van der Spoel, B. Stephenson, G. Stupakov, M. Sutton, A. Szöke, R. Tatchyn, A. Toor, E. Trakhtenberg, I. Vasserman, N. Vinokurov, X. J. Wang, D. Waltz, J. S. Wark, E. Weckert, Wilson-Squire Group, H. Winick, M. Woodley, A. Wootton, M. Wulff, M. Xie, R. Yotam, L. Young, and A. Zewail, *Linac Coherent Light Source (LCLS): Conceptual Design Report*, Tech. Rep. SLAC-R-593, UC-414 (Stanford Linear Accelerator Center (SLAC), Menlo Park, California, USA, 2002).

[13] P. Emma, R. Akre, J. Arthur, R. Bionta, C. Bostedt, J. Bozek, A. Brachmann, P. Bucksbaum, R. Coffee, F.-J. Decker, Y. Ding, D. Dowell, S. Edstrom, J. Fisher, A. Frisch, S. Gilevich, J. Hastings, G. Hays, Ph. Hering, Z. Huang, R. Iverson, H. Loos, M. Messerschmidt, A. Miahnahri, S. Moeller, H.-D. Nuhn, G. Pile, D. Ratner, J. Rzepiela, D. Schultz, T. Smith, P. Stefan, H. Tompkins, J. Turner, J. Welch, W. White, J. Wu, G. Yocky, and J. Galayda, "First lasing and operation of an ångstrom-wavelength free-electron laser," Nature Photon. **4**, 641–647 (2010).

[14] The essence of the linearity theorem of multiphoton absorption has already been stated in the third paragraph in the left column on page 2 of [8].

[15] Maria Göppert-Mayer, "Über Elementarakte mit zwei Quantensprüngen," Ann. Phys. (Leipzig) **17**, 273–294 (1931).

[16] G. Doumy, C. Roedig, S.-K. Son, C. I. Blaga, A. D. DiChiara, R. Santra, N. Berrah, C. Bostedt, J. D. Bozek, P. H. Bucksbaum, J. P. Cryan, L. Fang, S. Ghimire, J. M. Glownia, M. Hoener, E. P. Kanter, B. Krässig, M. Kuebel, M. Messerschmidt, G. G. Paulus, D. A. Reis, N. Rohringer, L. Young, P. Agostini, and L. F. DiMauro, "Nonlinear atomic response to intense ultrashort x rays," Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 083002 (2011).

[17] D. P. Craig and T. Thirunamachandran, *Molecular Quantum Electrodynamics* (Academic Press, London,

1984).

[18] M. Crance and M. Aymar, "Competition between direct process and stepwise process in multiphoton stripping of atoms. A model calculation in helium," J. Phys. France **46**, 1887–1896 (1985).

[19] Peter W. Milonni and Joseph H. Eberly, *Laser Physics*, 2nd ed. (John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, New Jersey, 2010).

[20] D. R. Hartree, "The wave mechanics of an atom with a non-coulomb central field. Part I. Theory and methods," Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. **24**, 89–110 (1928).

[21] Attila Szabo and Neil S. Ostlund, *Modern Quantum Chemistry: Introduction to Advanced Electronic Structure Theory*, 1st, revised ed. (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1989).

[22] See the Supplementary Data for a *Mathematica* [31] file with all computations presented in this work.

[23] For conceptual ease, I restrict myself here in considering the final state to be electron-bare which, however, is not necessarily required. Instead the single final state may also be a configuration which still has electrons in deep lying shells which is energetically to high in energy such that it cannot be ionized by the photons with the given energy.

[24] A fixed photon energy is assumed which needs to be high enough such that all electrons can be ionized; the dependence of the quantities on the photon energy is omitted throughout. If the x-ray photon energy is lower than the energy that is necessary to strip the system of all electrons, then the total absorption cross section of this last configuration—I assume that there is a single last configuration—is zero, although there are still electrons in lower lying shells. Increasing the x-ray photon energy renders the total absorption cross section nonzero. Please see figure 2 in [8] and its explanation. Only cationic configurations are included without regarding shake-off or shake-up processes and other multielectron effects such as double Auger decay.

[25] George B. Arfken and Hans J. Weber, *Mathematical Methods for Physicists*, 6th ed. (Elsevier Academic Press, New York, 2005).

[26] Theodore Allen Burton, *Volterra Integral and Differential Equations*, Mathematics in science and engineering No. 167 (Academic Press, New York, 1983).

[27] Peter Linz, *Analytical and Numerical Methods for Volterra Equations*, SIAM studies in applied mathematics No. 7 (Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, 1985).

[28] A. B. Bakushinskii, "Volterra equation," Encyclopedia of Mathematics http://www.encyclopediaofmath.org/index.php?title=Volterra_e Accessed 09 November 2016.

[29] B. V. Khvedelidze, "Sequential approximation, method of," Encyclopedia of Mathematics http://www.encyclopediaofmath.org/index.php?title=Sequential Accessed 09 November 2016.

[30] Alexander L. Fetter and John Dirk Walecka, *Quantum Theory of Many-Particle Systems*, International Series in Pure and Applied Physics, edited by Leonard I. Schiff (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1971).

[31] *Mathematica 11*, Wolfram Research, Inc., 100 Trade Center Drive, Champaign, Illinois 61820-7237, USA (2016).